go to 64,000. It is going to be a 10,000-case increase.

Should they be spending all of their time trying to intimidate employers? Employers simply want to hire employees that speak English. Are the employees going to be so scared that when they hire this employee they are going to be sued by the EEOC because they are saying to the employee, "We think it will be helpful for you to speak English to our customers"?

But as the Salvation Army did, they said, We will send you to a class for 1 year and you can learn English. So we will hire you, let you be trained, and hopefully after a year you will be conversant in English. These people didn't follow through and didn't even go to the classes. So what did the Salvation Army do, they simply said, We will have to fire you.

They talked to them, they counseled them, and then they said, We will have to let you go because you are not speaking English proficiently enough so that our customers can understand you, and we are an organization that simply has a mission to help and serve people, and we can't communicate with these people because you cannot speak English. So please go to this class that we are going to pay for and help you with this training. These people would not go, and so they were fired.

So now the EEOC lawyers are saying to its agency this case is of the highest priority. We are going to forget these 54,000 cases backlogged in America, and we are going to go after the Salvation Army.

"God help us" is the words that Mr. OBEY used. I say God help us if employers in this country cannot hire employees who speak English. We have every right to judge. This is not morally wrong, as Mr. Obey said, or constitutionally wrong. This is simply Congress saying set your priorities EEOC. Let the employers hire people who speak English. And we support the concept of what the EEOC is trying to do, to enact civil legislation against people who are discriminated against in the workplace. We understand that. We accept that. But this is a case of priorities. This is a case where Congress has every right as an equal branch to say this is wrong. I commend the chairman from New Jersey for his support.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

 $\operatorname{Mr.}$ FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.— None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Lobster Institute at the University of Maine in Orono, Maine. (b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.— The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Operations, Research, and Facilities" is hereby reduced by \$200,000.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike funding for the Lobster Institute at the University of Maine. We will be debating later today subsidies for corn, cotton, rice and sugar. This is about subsidizing lobsters. I frankly think we subsidize corn, cotton and sugar far too much, but lobster subsidies seem to be out of line as well.

I think taxpayers are already feeling the pinch, if you will, with high gas prices and huge deficits, and all of the other things that they are asked to pay for. But providing hard-earned taxpayer dollars to the lobster industry should make Members of this body a little red in the face.

According to the bill, the New England lobster industry will be receiving \$200,000 in Federal taxpayer dollars. The certification letter does not offer much in explanation of what it would be used for except to provide resources for the New England lobster industry. What kind of resources, I think we are justified in asking. This is a private industry that makes millions and millions of dollars annually. What possible support should the Federal taxpayer be offering to this particular industry?

Again, this is one area where Congress, through earmarking, is circumventing the regular process that we typically go through. It is a process that I don't like very much. I don't think we ought to be providing funding to the Federal agencies to give subsidies this way either. But there are programs at the Federal agencies, programs that are usually open to competitive bidding where people will submit grant proposals. But through earmarking like this, we circumvent that process and we say we know better what we're going to give what amounts to. It seems like a no-bid contract to a particular industry or business or group of industries.

So I would think that this simply isn't the way to go. I would submit that no amount of drawn butter can make this kind of subsidy taste any better. We simply shouldn't be doing this kind of thing. We need to get rid of these kinds of earmarks, again, when we know so very little about what it will go to. We are just told it will provide resources for the New England lobster industry. This is an industry, like some of the others we will be discussing later today, that do quite well on their own. They make millions and millions of dollars. What possible jus-

tification can we have for using Federal taxpayer dollars to subsidize or to support an industry like this?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. Flake. This amendment would strike funding for the Lobster Institute CORE Initiative for the University of Maine, a program vital to the continuation of the lobster industry.

I will say a few words in a moment about the importance of the lobster industry, not just to Maine, but to New England and to the entire Northeast, but I want to go straight to this particular program.

The Lobster Institute's CORE Initiative provides for conservation, outreach, research and education in order to sustain the lobster. This is one of the most successfully managed fisheries along the Atlantic coast. When you look at this from the point of view of the private sector, this is not a case of a big corporate fishery. The lobster industry is primarily a small fishery with individual lobstermen who cannot possibly afford to do the research on the scale that this institute does. I would say that the institute is funded primarily by contributions from the industry itself, some people who are contributing to the research, and through private donations by the Friends of the Lobster Institute.

But fundamentally, this kind of research done by our land grant universities is absolutely essential. The University of Maine does work on wild blueberries. It does work on potatoes. The industry itself could not possibly sustain industrywide research because those industries, like the lobster industry, are made up primarily of small businessmen and -women.

Frankly, it is exactly this kind of public-private partnership that makes our economy stronger than it ever could be without this support.

Let me give you some examples. The CORE program aims to establish a unified logical progression of research to address lobster health, stock assessment and environmental monitoring issues. For example, in southern New England, we have some very serious disease issues with some lobsters. We have to be able to track those diseases and make sure that we understand what is going on.

The program will also develop infrastructure to support lobster health and habitat research.

□ 1100

The information that is gathered by the institute is communicated to the public in many ways. Outreach education conducted by faculty, students and industry members, as well as conferences, seminars and workshops